

## Law Offices of

SENNIGER, POWERS, LEAVITT AND ROEDEL

One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102

Telephone (314) 231-5400

Facsimile (314) 231-4342

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 27 2005

## FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL COVER SHEET

DATE: May 27, 2005 ATTORNEY DOCKET NUMBER: KCC 4772  
PTO FACSIMILE NUMBER: (703) 872-9306 (K-C 16,738)PLEASE DELIVER THIS FACSIMILE TO: Examiner Michele M. Kidwell  
THIS FACSIMILE IS BEING SENT BY: Kurt F. James  
NUMBER OF PAGES: 2 INCLUDING COVER SHEETTIME SENT: 12:31 p.m. OPERATOR'S NAME Brenda C. Witschorek

## CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to  
the Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.Brenda C. Witschorek  
Typed or printed name of person signing certificationBrenda C. Witschorek May 27, 2005  
Signature DateType of paper transmitted: Applicant Initiated Interview  
Request FormApplicant's Name: Koele, et al.Serial No. (Control No.): 10/038,675 Examiner: Michele M. KidwellFiling Date: December 31, 2001 Conf. No.: 9036 Art Unit: 3761Application Title: MECHANICAL FASTENING SYSTEM FOR AN ABSORBENT  
ARTICLEIF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE ALL PAGES CLEARLY, CALL BACK AS SOON AS  
POSSIBLE. CONFIRMING NUMBER IS (314) 231-5400.

KCC 4772 (16,738)  
PATENT**Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form**

Application No.: 10/038,675 First Named Applicant: Mathew L. Koele  
Examiner: Michele Kidwell Art Unit: 3761 Status of Application: Final Rejection Mailed  
March 10, 2005 and Advisory Action Mailed May 13, 2005

**Tentative Participants:**(1) Examiner Kidwell (2) Kurt F. James (Reg. No. 33,716)Proposed Date of Interview: June 1, 2005Proposed Time: 11:00 a.m. Eastern RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**Type of Interview Requested:**(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

MAY 27 2005

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Issues To Be Discussed**

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc.)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) Rejection	53, 54		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:**

Applicants wish to discuss why the Examiner believes the amendments to claims 53 and 54 presented in applicants' Amendment D After Final filed May 2, 2005 would require further searching and consideration. First, applicants contend that all of the features recited in allowed claim 1 are recited in claims 53 and 54. Thus, claims 53 and 54 are allowable with no further searching or consideration for the same reasons claim 1 was found allowable.

Second, claims 53 and 54 were amended to overcome rejections under 35 USC § 112. As stated in M.P.E.P. § 2163, "where Office personnel establish a prima facie case of lack of written description for a claim, a thorough review of the prior art and examination on the merits for compliance with the other statutory requirements, including those of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112, is to be conducted prior to completing an Office action which includes a rejection for lack of written description." Thus, Applicants contend that the subject matter presented in claims 53 and 54 has already been searched and considered.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on \_\_\_\_\_.

**NOTE:**

This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature)\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)